



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/083,342	02/27/2002	Masayuki Ito	ASAM.0054	4032
38327	7590	09/22/2004	EXAMINER	
REED SMITH LLP 3110 FAIRVIEW PARK DRIVE, SUITE 1400 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22042			PEIKARI, BEHZAD	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2186	

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/083,342	ITO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	B. James Peikari	2186

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 February 2002.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 27 February 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .  |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/27/02</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                                  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Priority***

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

### ***Drawings***

2. The drawings are objected to because the text included in the drawings includes the same informalities noted below for the specification (e.g., "HISTORY INFORMATION STORAGE PART" instead of "HISTORY TABLE", "SWITCHING REGISTER", "ANY WAY IS HIT?", etc).

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of

the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

---

***Specification***

3. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

4. A substitute specification, including abstract, in proper idiomatic English and in compliance with 37 CFR 1.52(a) and (b) is required. The substitute specification filed must be accompanied by a statement that it contains no new matter.

The text of the disclosure appears to be a literal translation from the foreign priority document. While the examiner has been able to understand the general field of the invention based on the particular terms used (i.e., way prediction in a cache environment to provide faster data access) the paragraphs that describe the improvement or what applicant considers unique about the invention seem indecipherable to the extent that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be able to determine how the invention operates. Something is being done in parallel with the way prediction, but the examiner cannot determine what that might be.

### ***Claim Objections***

5. Claims 1-16 are objected to because of the following informalities: they contain the awkward language and errors in grammar similar to the specification, as described above. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Simply because the specification contains misspellings, poor grammar, or is a poor translation does not mean that it is not enabling for the claimed subject matter. However, when the explanation of a of one or more claim features is so poorly made in the specification that it cannot be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art, then that specification is *not* enabling.

A few examples of such claim features are taken from exemplary claim 1: "associative operation", "indexed cache line", "control means for making a way selected".

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

---

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Examples of claim features that are indefinite in claim 1 include:

- (a) the meaning of "associative operation" is vague...does this passage simply mean that the cache is an associative cache?
- (b) the meaning of "indexed cache line" is unclear ...does this mean a cache line that has tags in an associated index or does it mean that the cache line itself is part of an index?
- (c) "the prediction" has no antecedent basis.
- (d) it is unclear what is meant by "based on" in line 9.
- (e) "the subsequent access" has no antecedent basis.
- (f) the language "making a way selected" in line 13 is unclear...does this mean "selecting a way"?
- (g) "on the basis of" in line 16 is unclear.

In addition, as explained above, these features are not properly defined in the specification. This list is not meant to be exhaustive. These are only examples taken from the first claim. The claims and specification require thorough revision.

10. Due to the ambiguities and confusion in claims 1-16 as cited above, no art has been applied thereto, see *In re Steele*, 49 CCPA 1295, 305 F. 2d 859, 134 USPQ 292 (1962) and *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 165 USPQ 494 (CCPA 1970). The examiner will not speculate as to the intended meaning.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James Peikari whose telephone number is (703) 305-3824. The examiner is generally available between 8:00 am and 9:30 pm, EST, Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Kim, can be reached at (703) 305-3821.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

Application/Control Number: 10/083,342  
Art Unit: 2186

Page 7

(703) 746-7239 (Official communications)

or:

(703) 746-7240 (for Informal or Draft communications)

or:

(703) 746-7238 (for After-Final communications)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,  
Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

  
B. James Peikari  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2186

9/18/04